

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE HISTORIC CONSERVATION BOARD**  
**MONDAY, APRIL 23, 2007**  
**3:00 P.M., J. MARTIN GRIESEL ROOM, CENTENNIAL PLAZA II**

The Historic Conservation Board met at 3:04 P.M., in the J. Martin Griesel Room, Centennial Plaza II, with members Senhauser, Sullebarger, Spraul-Schmidt, Chatterjee, Wallace and Kreider present. Absent: Raser.

**MINUTES**

The Historic Conservation Board unanimously approved the minutes of the March 12, 2007 as amended (motion by Spraul-Schmidt, second by Sullebarger) and March 26, 2007 meetings (motion by Spraul-Schmidt, second by Chatterjee).

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, 508-510, 512 & 514-516 READING ROAD, OVER-THE-RHINE HISTORIC DISTRICT**

Staff member Adrienne Cowden presented a staff report (with no changes from the April 9, 2007 report) on a new façade and renovation on 508-510, 512 and 514-516 Reading Road. She stated that the Board had heard testimony at its April 9, 2007 meeting and that the applicant, Richard Hunter, was present if there were additional questions.

**BOARD ACTION**

The Board voted unanimously (motion by Spraul-Schmidt second by Chatterjee) to take the following actions:

1. Find that 508-510 Reading Road, based on the documentation presented in the staff report, is a non-contributing resource in the Over-the-Rhine Historic District.
2. Approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the renovation of 508-510, 512 and 514-516 Reading Road finding that the proposal meets the Over-the-Rhine Historic District conservation guidelines with the following conditions:
3. The main (south) façade brick exterior walls of 512 and 514-516 Reading Road shall be repainted. The side and rear elevations shall not be painted.
4. New windows installed in the first story of the main (south) façade of 514-516 Reading Road shall be sized and positioned to create a more uniform ranking unless this is precluded by the location of existing interior structural elements.
5. Final drawings and specifications shall be submitted to the Urban Conservator for review and approval prior to construction

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, 10 E. 15<sup>TH</sup> STREET, OVER-THE-RHINE HISTORIC DISTRICT**

Ms. Cowden presented a staff report that was changed from the April 9, 2007 report to include the Determination of Effect for a Section 106 Review. She stated that the windows that were installed do not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation or the conservation guidelines for the Over-the-Rhine Historic District. Ms. Cowden requested that the Board approve a one-over-one single or double-hung wooden sash.

**BOARD ACTION**

The Board voted unanimously (motion by Sullebarger second by Spraul-Schmidt) to take the following actions:

1. Find that the installed vinyl windows with a six-over-six sandwich grid do not meet the Over-the-Rhine Historic District conservation guidelines and deny a Certificate of Appropriateness.

2. Approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of new one-over-one single or double-hung sash that fit the openings without modification on the condition that final drawings and specifications shall be submitted to the Urban Conservator for review and approval prior to installation.
3. Determine that the proposed rehabilitation may be made to meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and therefore constitute No Adverse Effect if the installed Contour Colonial vinyl windows are removed and replaced with an appropriate wooden sash in all window openings as previously approved. This work shall be submitted to the Urban Conservator for review and approval prior to installation.

### **CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, 28 WEST CENTRAL PARKWAY, OVER-THE-RHINE HISTORIC DISTRICT**

Staff member Caroline Kellam presented a staff report on the proposal to paint a sepia toned mural measuring 30' tall and 38' wide directly on the windowless brick sidewall of 28 West Central Parkway. The wall borders a surface parking lot, so sits back approximately 45' from the street. The mural would feature a simple painted border with a caption stating the "Miami and Erie Canal circa 1900".

Artist Michael Blankenship stated that the mural would be part of the City's summer art works project. He also showed a drawing of a more elaborate decorative border as an alternative to the simple one proposed. He said he would like to add "at Vine Street circa 1900" to the text to identify the view of the original photo.

Mr. Chatterjee stated that he felt the frame was distracting and suggested the mural needed no frame. The Board agreed that both the border and text should be kept simple.

In response to Mr. Kreider's question on the permanence of the mural, Mr. Blankenship stated that he was the resident scenic artist at the College Conservatory of Music (CCM) and was familiar with large-scale projects. He said that CCM would donate working space and described the process he would use to create the mural. He added that he was researching mural paints and was confident the mural would be durable.

Mr. Senhauser stated that he had seen similar murals in Phoenix, Arizona. Ms. Sullebarger stated that she felt the mural would be a wonderful addition to the streetscape.

### **BOARD ACTION**

The Board voted unanimously (motion by Sullebarger second by Spraul-Schmidt) to take the following actions:

Approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for a painted mural on the south elevation of the building at 28 West Central Parkway as per plans submitted dated April 9, 2007 with the condition that the final plans with the text be submitted to the Urban Conservator prior to the installation.

### **CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS & HILLSIDE REVIEW, 432-434 LIBERTY HILL, PROSPECT HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT**

Ms. Cowden presented a staff report on the construction of a new two-family residence at 432-434 Liberty Hill. Ms. Cowden reminded the Board that it had conducted a preliminary design of this residence in July 2006. The applicant returned to the Board in February 2007 with a revised proposal. At the meeting the Board tabled consideration of the residence to allow the applicant to investigate design options to break up the massing of the building, to address various design elements and to resolve the issue of curb cuts with the Department of Transportation & Engineering.

Since that time, the applicant has revised the proposal. The primary changes involve modification to the floor to ceiling heights of each floor, fenestration type and patterns, relocating the garage doors and entrances, revisions to the third floor sunshade, and the addition of a cornice.

In response to Mr. Senhauser, the applicant Richard L. Butz stated that he had resolved the curb cut issues with DOTE by positioning the garages together to require a single curb cut.

In response to Mr. Senhauser, Ms. Cowden explained that staff was concerned that the new third floor windows with transoms and the bracketed sunscreen added height and weight, making the building appear top heavy and that staff preferred the earlier scheme. Mr. Butz responded that the taller windows in his revised design require the brackets. Mr. Senhauser stated that he felt the differences were minor.

Mr. Kreider stated that he felt the design emphasized verticality and that he approved of the design. Ms. Wallace stated that she agreed with staff recommendation to eliminate the sunscreens on the side elevations since such elements were not typically found on side elevations.

Mr. Forwood stated that the Zoning Code limited the building height to 35 feet and that as drawn, the revised design would likely require a variance. Mr. Butz said that the B&I had no problem with an earlier design which was similarly dimensioned, but agreed that if necessary, he would reduce the height to conform to the Code. The Board agreed that the house should not exceed the 35-foot maximum. Mr. Kreider stated that he would prefer that the coping band remain if the applicant shortens the building.

### **BOARD ACTION**

The Board voted unanimously (motion by Sullebarger second by Spraul-Schmidt) to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed two-family residence with the following conditions:

1. The sunshades on the building's side elevations shall be eliminated from the proposal.
2. Final plans and specifications shall be submitted to the Urban Conservator and the Chairman of the Historic Conservation Board for review and approval prior to construction.

### **CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, HILLSIDE REVIEW & ZONING VARIANCES, 1875 KEYS CRESCENT, EAST WALNUT HILLS HISTORIC DISTRICT**

Ms. Kellam stated that the staff report was unchanged from that presented at the April 9, 2007 hearing.

### **BOARD ACTION**

The Board voted unanimously (motion by Sullebarger second by Spraul-Schmidt) to take the following actions:

1. Find that although the fence is technically in the front yard of 1875, the west property line was originally a side yard and still appears like a side yard.
2. Grant the following zoning variance for the height of the fence as per Chapter 1421-33 (b) of the Cincinnati Zoning Code for 1875 Keys Crescent finding that such relief from the literal implication of the Zoning Code:
  - a) Is necessary and appropriate in the interest of historic conservation so as not to adversely affect the historic architectural or aesthetic integrity of the district; and
  - c) Will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare or injurious to the property in the district or vicinity where the property is located.
3. Approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a 6' high wrought iron fence on 1875 Keys Crescent with the condition that any revisions and final plans be

reviewed and approved by the Urban Conservator prior to issuing a Certificate of Appropriateness and a building permit.

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, HILLSIDE REVIEW & ZONING VARIANCES,  
3733 SACHEM AVENUE, COLUMBIA-TUSCULUM HISTORIC DISTRICT**

Ms. Kellam presented a staff report with minor changes from that prepared for the April 9, 2007 Board meeting. Revisions were made to correct dimensions for side yard setback variances and area calculations. She also distributed a letter from Meghan Young clarifying her testimony at the April 9, 2007 meeting.

Joel King, of Gary Brasch Custom Homes stated that his April 9, 2007 testimony was unchanged. In response to Ms. Sullebarger, he stated that the garage door on the proposed house is larger than the one owned by Meghan Young, the next-door neighbor.

Mr. Senhauser commented that the height of the proposed house breaks the rhythm of the other houses on that side of Sachem Avenue. The project designer Bruce Murray stated that the height of the basement wall could be reduced or the finished floor lowered to reduce the overall height of the house by one foot. Ms. Sullebarger said that she favored reducing the height of the wall to be more in line with the foundations of neighboring homes.

Mr. Senhauser stated that based on the testimony at the April 9 meeting, he believed the greatest concern was the rear yard setback. He said that granting a front yard setback to twelve and one-half feet would help alleviate the problem in the rear, yet keep the house in line with the downhill neighbors. In response to Ms. Sullebarger, Andy Crain, 3735 Sachem, stated that he would be agreeable to the front yard setback variance if it reduced the protrusion of the house into the rear yard.

Vince Stamp, owner of 3734 Sachem Avenue, stated that he felt the proposed house should be similar in size to the other “painted ladies” on the street. He stated that the owner knew that his property was in the Historic District and should adhere to the regulations.

Nick Markwold and Kimberly Markwold of 3748 Sachem Avenue stated that they still had concerns with the mass and scale of the proposed house. Ms. Markwold added that she felt the line and rhythm of the houses should be maintained and the guidelines followed. She stated that she felt that the owner was trying to “fit a large peg in a small hole”.

Ms. Sullebarger suggested shortening the length of the building. She also suggested that a carriage type door be used for the garage.

Mr. Murray stated that he would be able to reduce the depth by a foot or two but not by ten feet. It was generally agreed that the house could be reduced in depth to align with rear corner of Megan Young’s residence at 3731 Sachem. If the front yard variance were granted, the resulting footprint would be sufficiently large to salvage the plan.

Applicant Mark Chambers said that he would be agreeable to lowering the foundation by one foot as discussed. He said that he wanted to build a house congruous to the neighborhood and hoped to receive a positive decision.

**BOARD ACTION**

The Board voted unanimously (motion by Sullebarger second by Spraul-Schmidt) to take the following actions:

1. Grant the following variances to the Zoning Code to permit:
  - A. A front yard setback of 12’-6”
  - B. A rear yard setback equal to that of 3731 Sachem Avenue and

C. Side yard setbacks 1'-0" and 4'-0"

finding that such relief from the literal implication of the Zoning Code:

- a. Is necessary and appropriate in the interest of historic conservation so as not to adversely affect the historic architectural or aesthetic integrity of the district; and
  - b. Will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare or injurious to the property in the district or vicinity where the property is located.
2. Approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a new single-family house with an attached one-car garage with the following conditions:
- a. The first floor final elevation will be lowered by 1 foot.
  - b. The applicant must submit an acceptable landscape plan.
  - c. Any revisions and final plans be reviewed and approved by the Urban Conservator prior to issuing a Certificate of Appropriateness and a building permit.

**PRELIMINARY DESIGN REVIEW, MULBERRY, SEITZ AND SYCAMORE STREETS,  
OVER-THE-RHINE HISTORIC DISTRICT**

Ms. Cowden presented a staff report on the construction of seven new townhouses on Seitz and Mulberry Streets at Sycamore. She said that the property is zoned RM-0.7 (Residential Multi-Family) and is located in a Hillside District. She gave a brief overview of the history of the property and indicated that the now vacant lots once contained masonry buildings facing Sycamore Street that were similar in size to the remaining neighbors.

Four of the proposed new residences will front onto Seitz Street. The remaining three buildings will face Mulberry Street. The rowhouses are 3-stories tall and stepped to accommodate changes in grade. The first floor garages on the Mulberry Street rowhouses will face the street; those on Seitz will be accessed from a driveway off of Sycamore Street.

The applicant Del Ogle stated that the rowhouses have been designed and sited to take advantage of the view and provide off-street parking. The Sycamore Street drive is necessitated by the steep change in grade.

Mr. Senhauser said that he understands the site constraints but the project had an equal obligation to the street and pedestrian traffic. He suggested that Mr. Ogle use hard and soft landscaping to reinforce the connection. Mr. Kreider said that the end units should be redesigned to appear as corner buildings to acknowledge Sycamore Street.

Mr. Chatterjee suggested making design changes to the elevations to create rhythm with the streetscape. Ms. Sullebarger stated that the rowhouses seem compatible to others in the district. Ms. Wallace agreed that the units could have greater street appeal, but applauded the developer's design and use of the lot and city view.

**ADJOURN**

As there were no other items for consideration by the Board, the meeting adjourned.

---

William L. Forwood  
Urban Conservator

---

John C. Senhauser  
Chairman

Date: \_\_\_\_\_